

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF THE CONCEPT OF A
"UNIFIED FIELD WITH HUMAN BEINGS"

KRYSPIN, JAN, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Rehabilitation Medicine
The Wellesley Hospital
Toronto, Ontario. CANADA

SUMMARY:

Four years ago I formulated a concept that anticipated some development of the science of consciousness. Using the notion of "field" I have implied that the phenomenon of human consciousness could be contained within the framework of physics I was familiar with at that time. The prerequisite was the compatibility of Riemannian geometry with all phenomena of consciousness. The Riemannian geometry was an "intrinsic" geometry of a system independent of any external preconceived notions of space as we understand it in the Euclidean sense. Riemannian geometry applicable to human consciousness would be characterized by some elementary quantity pertaining to any system that we observe; the measurements and rules are determined solely by that system and not by some arbitrary, extrinsic standards.

Typically, the element of length Δs is defined by the metric tensor g_{jk} of Riemannian geometry.

$$\Delta s^2 = g_{jk} dn^j dn^k$$

with $n^1 \dots n^n$ being local co-ordinates of a Riemannian space.

I have felt that these geometrical considerations were necessary to account for the reality of consciousness in the physical sense. I have also felt that the concept of "field" was necessary to explain some aspects of connectedness of the phenomena of life and particularly of the reality of consciousness. In the meantime, I have had an opportunity to study the work of Ted Bastin, a physicist and to become more acquainted with the ideas of E. Wigner regarding the relation between physics and consciousness.

I have realized that physics deals only with rather special aspects of reality which it tries to characterize by a few simple principles with wide consequences. Thus it leaves a vast range of phenomena outside its domain. It became clear to me that a "unified field" is not necessarily a concept of sufficient universality to begin with and that a pre-geometrical analysis of consciousness-related phenomena is necessary at this stage.

I understand consciousness to be a model of reality- whether it is in a neuro-physiological, psychological or theologico-political sense. Each of these aspects is described, respectively, by a language that reflects a historical

development of concepts within a specific domain. By naming concepts and refining their relations the reality becomes reflected in human consciousness. And thus a reconciliation of opposites of "objective" and "subjective" in our perception is achieved. This may be on an elementary level (consciousness as opposed to unconsciousness in the medical sense) or on a highly elaborate level (theological or political consciousness. My methodological approach is minimalist because it tries to avoid juxtaposition of unrelated conceptual frameworks to account for discontinuities in explanation.

This approach can be traced back to Avicenna, Nicholas of Cusa, Leibniz, Cantor and Riemann. From a purely qualitative point of view, each of them has developed a methodology to deal with ultimate concerns of human existence and reason. Avicenna's method exerted a profound influence on the scientific thought and medical practice in the Middle Ages; Leibniz, Cantor and Riemann have anticipated the crisis of atomistic philosophy and developed concepts that have not yet been fully appreciated by the present scientific community.

The essential qualitative features of the new model I am proposing here are: monistic outlook that reconciles the hitherto irreconcilable antinomies (atomism-continuity; finite-infinite; freedom-determinism, information-uniformity, etc.) in a new quality (e.g. the Leibnizian monad; my concept of achievement).

New experimental modes to overcome the isolationist, pseudo-objective mode of experimentation of the 18th and 19th centuries (that still persists today).

A unified approach to creative human endeavours that does not make distinctions between the domains of science and art but uses the method of Socratic dialogue to achieve the highest level of reason. The Socratic dialogue I understand as a study of reality based on an analysis of both the preconscious and conscious opposite notions and their reconciliation in a hierarchically organized and dynamic interchange.

January, 1979.